

Central Business District
Architectural Review Committee
Meeting Minutes

Date: December 18, 2014

Location: City Hall, 1300 Perdido Street, 7th Floor, New Orleans, LA

Called to order: 9:30 a.m.

Adjourned: 11:30 a.m.

Members Present: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King

Members arriving after beginning of the meeting:

Members absent: Lee Ledbetter, Brooks Graham

I. AGENDA

1. Approval of the minutes of the November ARC Meeting

Motion: Defer approval of the minutes to January.

By: Elliott Perkins

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robby Cangelosi, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

2. 611-15 Commerce Street:

Application: Demolition of existing warehouse and construction of 5-story, approximately 21,315 sf, multi-family residential building.

Motion: Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend that the Commission grant conceptual approval of the proposed new construction with the following recommendation and the details to be worked out at the Staff level:

- The ARC preferred elevation proposal B-5, provided the fire egress door and cornice of proposal B-2 are substituted.

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robbie Cangelosi, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

3. 632 Tchoupitoulas St, 619-631 Commerce St:

Application: Demolition of existing building remnant and construction of a new 7-story, 108,831 sf hotel with full service restaurant on existing vacant lot.

Motion: The ARC agreed that the proposed vestigial "canopy" element at the cornice is not successful as it is incongruous with cornice treatments within the district and does not serve a practical purpose. However, the committee did agree that there should be some type of architectural termination at the

parapet. They would be open to a scaled back version of this element which should be explored. The ARC found the alternate scheme of the Tchoupitoulas facade to be the most appropriate of the two presented.

Ashley King made a motion for conceptual approval with the recommendations of the ARC and the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robbie Cangelosi, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

4. 129 University Place

Application: Installation of new exterior lighting, canopy and blade sign

Motion: Elliott Perkins made a motion for conceptual approval with the details to be worked out at the staff level.

Seconded: Ashley King

Result: No Action

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed: Robbie Cangelosi

Motion: The ARC agreed that the proposed lighting "Option A" and blade sign are appropriate. However, they did not find the proposed canopy to be successful. Although they agreed that it reflects the same design elements as the blade sign, there should be further refinement of detail reflecting that of the quality of the historic landmark building. Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend conceptual approval of the lighting and blade sign with the details to be worked out at the Staff level and Elliott to defer action on the canopy.

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Comments:

5. 333 St. Charles Avenue

Application: Upgrades to the exterior of the existing building. Includes lighting, changes to existing canopy and addition of mosaic at front entry.

Motion: The ARC agreed that the mosaic panels should be "floated" off of the existing masonry walls with the metal edge band detail on all four sides of the panel so that it is held off of the ground and away from the existing side and top moldings.

Robbie Cangelosi made a motion for conceptual approval of the proposal with the details to be worked out at the Staff level.

Seconded: Ashley King

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Ashley King, Robbie Cangelosi

Opposed:

Comments:

6. 838 Camp Street

Application: Construction of new dormer on rear roof slope.

Motion: The ARC agreed the triple-wide, gable end, Greek Revival dormer presented is inappropriately large and does not fit stylistically with the building. The ARC suggested it could be appropriate to propose two, traditionally sized and detailed gable-end dormers, or alternately, a single, wide, simply detailed, shed-roofed eyebrow dormer. However, the top edge of any dormer roof needs to be lower than the

existing roof ridge, and the ARC expressed concern that it would not be possible to obtain the required interior head-height clearance with an eyebrow dormer design.

Elliott Perkins made a motion to recommend denial of the proposal as presented.

Seconded: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In favor: Elliott Perkins, Robbie Cangelosi, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

7. 823 Canal Street

Application: Modifications to an existing storefront

Motion: The ARC agreed that they would prefer the proposal that involved the removal of the existing exterior mounted roll-up security grille as shown in the photo montage rendering. However, if that is cost prohibitive, they would support installing a high quality storefront system with the door centered between two display windows. The door and windows should extend as high as possible fitting under the existing security grille housing. Elliott Perkins made a motion to defer action on the application until drawings adequately depicting the intended design can be presented.

Second: Robbie Cangelosi

Result: Passed

In Favor: Robbie Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments:

8. 623 Canal Street

Application: Modifications to exterior of building

Motion: The ARC noted that the relationship between the proposed modifications and the existing decorative elements is still unclear and/or unsuccessful. Your revised proposal should show galleries that respond to the elements of the existing architecture such as masonry banding and articulated window sills. You should provide detailed sections showing relationships to gallery deck levels and interior finish floors. Pipe columns are only appropriate at the street level. Decorative iron pilasters with matching corbels should be used at upper levels. A roof covering the second floor gallery could be considered. Overall, the ARC agreed that the second level gallery is possible, the third floor gallery is unlikely to be approved and the fourth floor balcony is not appropriate. Robbie Cangelosi made a motion to deny the application as proposed.

Second: Elliott Perkins

Result: Passed

In Favor: Robbie Cangelosi, Elliott Perkins, Ashley King

Opposed:

Comments: